

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION

AUDREY WILLIAMS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 2:12-CV-016 JD
)	
NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER)	
CORPORATION, d/b/a AMTRAK, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions. [DE 122]. This Court referred the motion to Magistrate Judge Cherry, who filed a Report and Recommendation on October 9, 2014, recommending that the motion be denied. [DE 167]. After referring a dispositive motion to a magistrate judge, a district court has discretion to accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the district court must undertake a de novo review "only of those portions of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection is made." *See Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999) (citing *Goffman v. Gross*, 59 F.3d 668, 671 (7th Cir. 1995)). If no objection or only a partial objection is made, the court reviews those unobjected portions for clear error. *Id.* Under the clear error standard, a court will only overturn a magistrate judge's ruling if the court is left with "the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made." *Weeks v. Samsung Heavy Indus. Co., Ltd.*, 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir.1997).

The time for objections to the Report and Recommendation has now passed, and no party has objected, so this Court's review is for clear error. Having reviewed the Report and

Recommendation and finding no clear error therein, the Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation [DE 167] in its entirety. Plaintiff's motion for sanctions [DE 122] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: October 30, 2014

/s/ JON E. DEGUILIO
Judge
United States District Court